REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on 5/12/2009. Claims 1-14, 16, 26-30, and 36-38 are rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1 and 36 have been amended. No new matter has been added. No claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-14, 16, 26-30, and 36-38 are presented for examination.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 36

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 36 has been amended for clarification. Applicant submits that claim 36, as amended, is definite and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-14, 16, 26-30, and 36-38

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-4, 16, 26-30, and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being allegedly rendered obvious by Bindra, "Programmable SOC Delivers a New Level of System Flexibility", 2000, in view of Hamblen, "Rapid Prototyping Using Field Programmable Logic Devices, 6-2000."

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method for configuring a microcontroller, comprising:
   displaying a first graphical user interface on a display device of a computer system, said first graphical user interface comprising a collection of virtual blocks in a design system;

receiving at said computer system a selection of a user module, wherein said user module comprises information for implementing a function using a programmable physical block;

displaying on said display device a second graphical user interface operable for receiving user-specifiable information about said user module;

assigning a virtual block taken from said collection to said user module, wherein said virtual block corresponds to said programmable physical block; and

constructing computer-generated source code that is loaded into a register of said programmable physical block to cause said programmable physical block to implement said function, *wherein constructing the computer-generated source code comprises substituting said user-specifiable information for generic information in a template file.* (Emphasis added.)

The Office Action alleges that the user modules of Bindra can be considered as reading on the computer-generated source code as recited in amended claim 1. Even assuming *arguendo* that the user modules of Bindra can be considered as reading on the computer-generated source code of claim 1, Bindra still does not teach or suggest the use of template files, much less that constructing the computer-generated source code comprises substituting user-specifiable information for generic information in a template file.

Hamblen also does not teach or suggest this feature of amended claim 1. Hamblen teaches a C compiler that automatically generates a code generator (Page 35, last paragraph), however, Hamblen does not teach or suggest using a template file for generating code, much less that constructing computer generated source code comprises substituting user-specifiable information for generic information in a template file.

Since neither Bindra nor Hamblen teaches or suggests this feature of claim 1, as amended, the combination of Bindra and Hamblen cannot be interpreted as

disclosing the claimed feature. Claim 1, as amended, is therefore not rendered obvious by the combination of Bindra and Hamblen. Claims 13 and 26 include a similar feature as amended claim 1, and are therefore also not rendered obvious by the combination. Dependent claims 2-12, 14, 16, 27-30, and 36-38 are also not rendered obvious by the combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14, 16, 26-30, and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Bindra and Hamblen.

Conclusion

Claims 1-14, 16, 26-30, and 36-38 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's attorney, Kerry Liang, by telephone at (408) 545-7399. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address given below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.20 and 1.21 that may be required to maintain pendency of the present application, and to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 50-3781.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 8/12/2009

/Kerry Liang/
Kerry Liang
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,519

Cypress Semiconductor Corporation
198 Champion Court
San Jose, CA 95134
Facsimile: (408) 545-6911
Customer No.: 60909